

A/B, 2/33/22

9 September 1952

MEMORANDUM REPORT

TO:

FROM: Chief, Office of Security

SUBJECT: Test of New Interrogation Technique

Purpose and Authority

1. By DIR 13030, dated 9 August 1952, desire was expressed to send Artichoke team of five members to [REDACTED] to test new technique during period from 16 August to 9 September. Ten subjects were requested - also safe house and other necessary facilities.

2. By [REDACTED] dated 13 August 1952, DIR was informed that H-B/3 visit of team was considered inadvisable.

3. By DIR 114931, dated 16 August 1952, explanation was furnished for necessity of visit, namely that a commitment to [REDACTED] had been made and that [REDACTED] team was already in [REDACTED] awaiting our team and our support.

B3
Participation

1. [REDACTED] team

A.

B.

B6

B/6

C.

D.

2. Artichoke Team

A. [REDACTED], Washington Headquarters

B.

C. [REDACTED] Technical Specialist, I & S

D. [REDACTED] Technician, I & S

3. Subjects for Testing

A. [REDACTED]

B. [REDACTED]

C. [REDACTED]

D. [REDACTED]

E. [REDACTED]

4. Operational Personnel

Various persons interested in and concerned with the handling of the subjects and in the effectiveness of the technique being tested, including representatives of [REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED] and others, participated in the testing efforts.

Division Chiefs, case officers, interpreters and others cooperated in an admirable manner to provide maximum favorable conditions for the testing.

5. Support

A full measure of support was provided by the Office of Administration and Logistics. Coordination was effected by the Office

of Security. It is felt that all possible facilities and services were made available to the teams to further their efforts. Included in this category were transportation and reservation services for return trips to the U.S., finances to provide food and equipment at site of operation, transportation for official business of team members and others, guard service by [REDACTED] safe house and B/3 interrogation center facilities, food rations, technical equipment and services, hotel and housing accommodations, conference rooms and courtesy services such as cards, rations, etc.

Discussion

1. The writer has noted hereinafter his personal impressions and the impressions expressed to him by others who took part in the tests. The writer's impressions are drawn principally from conversations with persons who participated in the tests or who observed them and from conferences of case officers and team members which he attended.

B/6 2. [REDACTED] who headed the team sponsored by the [REDACTED] was in complete charge of the administration of the tests and they were carried out under his direction. In this capacity, he displayed a distinct lack of confidence and called frequently upon other team members and particularly upon his assistant [REDACTED] for guidance in his decisions as to what methods and steps should be employed at successive stages of the testing. At no time during the testing efforts did [REDACTED] appear to be self-assured and in command of the situation.

B/6

3. Testing consisted of interrogation of the subjects before and after administering chemical "substances" identified as "L", "G", and "Q" in varying dosages and combinations. The substances were given to the subjects in coffee or beer under conditions approximating in so far as possible, informal social conversations in a friendly vein. Theoretically, the subjects were unwitting of the fact that the "substances" had been introduced into their beverages. In fact, however, some complained of an unpleasant bitterness in their drinks.

4. It was explained by [REDACTED] that the "substance" would cause the subject to become friendly toward his interrogator, volatile and expansive in his conversation, self-confident and unafraid, free of certain conscious and unconscious inhibitions, and generally disposed to discuss freely subject matter which normally he might wish to withhold.

B/6
5. Contrary to initial understandings, [REDACTED] advised the team members and certain case officers in conference that the "substance" could not be expected to weaken or overcome a subject's motivation for deception, and further, that if a subject were a liar, the substance might cause him to lie more and with more conviction.

6. In response to questioning, [REDACTED] seemed unable to establish what types of subjects he thought might provide the best material for successful testing. Certain objections were raised to every type of available subject suggested. Upon being pressed, [REDACTED] finally agreed that any type provided would serve his

[REDACTED]

purpose "within reasonable limitations". The subjects provided and accepted met the qualifications as set forth in advance notifications from Washington.

7. The impression was very definitely gained by the writer, by all the case officers and interrogators with whom he discussed the matter and by all members of the Artichoke team (I & S), that [REDACTED] is:

B/6

- A. Not sure of the results to expect from his substance.
- B. Not sure of the proper dosages and combinations to administer.
- C. Not in possession of sufficient basic laboratory testing results.
- D. Unable to evaluate the results obtained from testing.
- E. Not prepared to carry out conclusive field testing.
- F. Not temperamentally suited to direct or supervise field testing of the type attempted.
- G. Bewildered, confused and uncertain as a result of the conditions and reactions encountered in the course of the tests which were made.
- H. Certain case officers and interrogators are willing to admit that it is highly probable that some merit is possessed by the "substances" for eventual aid in interrogative effort, but that much refinement of the technique is necessary before it can be concluded to be effective.

9. Certain others who followed the testing operations in whole or in part are ready to conclude that the technique has no demonstrable value whatever.

10. A significant remark by [REDACTED] is, in substance, to the effect that he has learned much through his experience with the tests performed, notably that the subjects provided reacted quite differently from the college seniors he has used as subjects previously. B/6

11. In contradiction to his expressed willingness to disclose the identity of the "substance" to [REDACTED] team members after the first test, he declined to do so, stating that the team members had "not permitted him to know them" as fully as he thought they should and he therefore would consider it "less than patriotic" if he disclosed the chemical composition of the substances. B/3

12. The leader of the Artichoke (I & S) team advised that a comprehensive report of the tests in [REDACTED] will be prepared and forwarded through the Deputy Director for Administration to the DCI. F

Conclusions

1. The field testing effort in [REDACTED] was inadequately planned and premature in execution. F

2. The results of the testing were inconclusive and generally unsatisfactory.

Recommendations

B/3 It is recommended that the DCI be succinctly advised that five subjects meeting the qualifications prescribed by preliminary notification were field tested by visiting teams sponsored by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] respectively under conditions of maximum support by the [REDACTED] using newly developed interrogation technique with results considered to be inconclusive and generally unsatisfactory.

G